

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 were pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 13, and 17 have been canceled and claims 2-5, 7-8, 12, 14-16 and 18-24 have been amended. Following entry of the amendments, claims 2-12, 14-16 and 18-24 will be pending and at issue.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants have canceled claims 1, 13, and 17 and amended claims 2-5, 7-8, 12, 14-16, and 18-24 to more particularly point out the subject matter of the invention. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101 and request that the Examiner's rejections on this ground be withdrawn. Claims 2, 14, and 18 have been amended to be independent claims.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,442). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection. Applicants have canceled claims 1, 13, and 17 and amended claims 2-5, 7-8, 12, 14-16, and 18-24. However, these claims have not been canceled or amended as a result of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

With respect to claim 1, the limitations of which have now been rewritten in independent form as amended claim 2, the Examiner states that Chen discloses a method for information extraction comprising: accessing a plurality of related articles; determining a seed article from the related articles; and identifying at least one information field within the seed article by comparing the seed article to at least one other related article.

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Chen does not disclose identifying at least one information field within the seed article by comparing the seed article to at least one related article. Chen simply does not discuss the comparison of a seed article to at least one related article.

Rather, Chen's document management application program searches "the STG directory for documents that match the category criteria of a given smart folder." (Col. 7, lines 42-43) As further described in Chen, "the user constructs category criteria...[that] are then associated with a folder" and the application then "searches through all or a portion of the STG files for documents that have attributes matching the category criteria." (Col. 8, lines 17-26) Thus, the cited reference does not describe the comparison of a seed article to at least one related article.

In addition, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Chen does not disclose creating a template. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate where such a description of creating a template can be found in Chen.

In order for a reference to anticipate an invention, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, the rejection of amended claim 2 is not supported by the reference and should be withdrawn.

Claims 3-12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 2. Claims 3-12 also include recitations that further define the claimed invention such as but not limited to the "information field corresponds to variable data" and "the related articles are web pages on a web site" that are not present in Chen. Based on their dependence on claim 2 and other patentable recitations, claims 3-12 are also believed to be patentable.

With regard to claims 12-24, the Examiner asserted that "these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims above." The grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner appear directed at the limitations of claims 1-12. There is no specific discussion of any of the features of the other rejected claims.

For example, with regard to claims 12 and 14, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate where the following limitations can be found in Chen: identifying a plurality of templates each comprising at least one information field; comparing a source article to the templates to determine a closest template; associating data from the source article with an information field from the closest template; and extracting the associated data.

Additionally, with regard to claim 15, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate where the following limitation can be found in Chen: wherein comparing the source article to the templates is performed by a dynamic programming alignment algorithm to compute an edit distance between the source article and the templates.

Also, with regard to claim 16, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate where the following limitation can be found in Chen: wherein the source article is a web page.

Because of the many distinct features of these claims, the Examiner's omnibus rejection is improper. See M.P.E.P § 707.07 (d) ("A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group.") For this reason the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAIG NEVILL-MANNING, ET AL.

Dated: July 19, 2006

By: Brenda M. Simon

Brenda M. Simon
Reg. No. 48,449
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7198
Fax.: (650) 938-5200